1	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) United States Attorney			
2 3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division			
4 5 6 7	TIMOTHY J. LUCEY (CABN 172332) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7200 Fax: (415) 436-7234 E-Mail: Timothy.Lucey@usdoj.gov			
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
12 13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) 1	No. CR 09 - 01195 JF	
14	Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND	
15	V.		PROPOSED] ORDER	
16	RODNEY HATFIELD, et al.,)		
17	Defendants.)		
18		.)		
19	WHEREAS, the government has produced in excess of 30,000 pages of discovery to			
20	counsel for the defendants, and where the discovery includes financial records, trading records,			
21	and emails, such that the matter is considered complex under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii);			
22	WHEREAS, counsel for the defendants need sufficient time to review the discovery, in			
23	order to effectively prepare for the defense of this matter, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §			
24	3161(h)(7)(B)(iv);			
25	WHEREAS, counsel for the parties	jointly ag	ree and stipulate that a continuance of this	
26	matter is appropriate given the and the need for effective preparation of counsel and where the			
27	next available date where all counsel are available is October 14, 2010, such that there is a need			
28	for a continuance to such date based on co	ntinuity of	counsel, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §	

1

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER [09 - 01195 JF]

1 3

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER [09 - 01195 JF]

3161(h)(7)(B)(iv);

THEREFORE, the parties mutually and jointly stipulate that the matter should be continued, based on the complexity of this case, the need for effective preparation of counsel, and the need for continuity of counsel, and the parties jointly request that the Court continue the matter until **Thursday**, **October 14**, **2010**, **at 9:00 a.m.** The parties agree that continuing the case until October 14, 2010, is necessary, given the complexity of the case, the need for defense counsel to review and analyze a large amount of discovery, and the need to maintain continuity of counsel. The parties also agree that failing to grant a continuance would deny counsel for the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

The parties also agree, and the Court has found previously, that the case involves government allegations of a complicated fraud scheme with substantial evidence, both paper and electronic, and that thus "the case is so unusual or so complex, due to . . . the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established" by the Speedy Trial Act. <u>See</u> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(7)(ii).

Finally, the parties agree that the ends of justice served by excluding time from September 2, 2010, until October 14, 2010, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. <u>Id.</u> § 3161(h)(A).

STIPULATED:

DATED:

/S/

GEOFFREY A. BRAUN Attorney for RODNEY H

1	(0.1			
2	DATED: VARELL L. FULLER			
3	Assistant Federal Public Defender Attorney for LLOYD MYERS			
4				
5				
6	DATED: /S/			
7	Assistant United States Attorney			
8				
9				
10	<u>ORDER</u>			
11	For good cause shown, the Court continues the matter until Thursday, October 14 ,			
12	2010, at 9:00 a.m.			
13	The Court enters this order excluding time from September 2, 2010, up to and including			
14	October 14, 2010. Specifically, the parties agree, and the Court finds and holds that such that			
15	time should be excluded until October 14, 2010, and furthermore that failing to grant a			
16	continuance until October 14, 2010, would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of			
17	counsel, and also would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective			
18	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. §			
19	3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).			
20	The parties also agree, and the Court finds and holds, that the case involves government			
21	allegations of a complicated fraud scheme with substantial evidence, both paper and electronic,			
22	and that thus "the case is so unusual or so complex, due to the nature of the prosecution, or			
23	the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate			
24	preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established" by the			
25	Speedy Trial Act. <u>See</u> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii).			
26	////			
27	////			
28	////			
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER [500, 01105 HE] 3			

Case 5:09-cr-01195-EJD Document 30 Filed 09/02/10 Page 4 of 4

Finally, the parties agree, and the Court finds and holds, that the ends of justice served by excluding time from September 2, 2010, through October 14, 2010, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. $\underline{\text{Id.}} \ \S \ 3161(h)(A)$.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/1/10

HON. JEREN Y FOGEL United States District Judge

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER [09 - 01195 JF]